

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 30, 2009. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 1, 4-11, 14-21, and 24-28 stand for consideration in this application, wherein claims 1, 11, and 20 are currently amended, and claims 2-3, 12-13, and 22-23 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

All amendments to the application are fully supported therein, and Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 2, 5, and 6

Claims 2, 5, and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because “[c]laims 2, 5, and 6 state ‘the termination processes’ without having stated any initial termination processes”

The subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1, which now recites “wherein the first process is a process for terminating ...” and “wherein the second process is a process for terminating” Consequently, claim 2 has been canceled, and the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is moot.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from amended claim 1, which, as discussed, now provides proper antecedent basis for reciting “the termination processes.”

Claim 21

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because “[c]laim 21 first states ‘a mobile terminal or a mobile router’ and then continues with a limitation stating ‘the mobile terminal and the mobile router.’”

Claim 21 has been amended to clarify that the home agent is “connected to a mobile terminal and a mobile router,” to eliminate the alleged indefiniteness.

Claims 12-18

Claims 12-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because “[c]laims 12-18 claim first and second processes from independent claim 11 but do not state if they are the first and second process of the terminal or the server.”

Claims 12-13 have been canceled.

Claims 14-16 recite “wherein the first and second process executed by the terminal” Further, claim 17 recites “the first process executed by the terminal and the second process carried out in the terminal” Claim 18 depends from claim 17, but does not explicitly recite the “first and second processes.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 14-18 are definite that the first and second processes are “of the terminal.”

Accordingly, withdrawal of rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9-17, and 18-27

Claims 1-7, 9-17, and 18-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patil et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142673 A1) (“Patil”) in view of Grohoski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,392,399 B2) (“Grohoski”). This rejection is respectfully traversed, although independent claims 1, 11, and 20 have been amended.

As amended, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

a memory for storing programs to be executed by the CPU to execute first and second processes on a packet received from the transmission/reception part

wherein the first process is a process for terminating a first security process for the received packet;

wherein the second process is a process for terminating a second security process for the received packet; and

wherein the first and second processes are executed on the same layer of said received packet.

Thus, first and second processes for terminating first and second security processes (e.g., IPsec processes), respectively, are executed against a received packet in the same layer. Advantageously, two security processes are duplicitely executed in a system, such as a system which requires two duplicitely executed security processes.

It is acknowledged in the Office Action that Patil “does not teach executing first and second processes on a packet wherein the first and second processes are the processes executed on the same layer of said received packet.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Patil does not teach the aspects of amended claim 1 described above, which further define the first process and the second process.

It is alleged that Grohoski teaches:

[E]xecuting first and second processes on a packet (Grohoski et al, Fig. 2 Col. 6, Lines 49-67 and Col. 7 Lines 1-12, A packet is received that is a crypto and then at a first processor additional data is identified for processing the packet (first or second process) and then the packet is sent to the crypto processor where the packet is processed using the additional data (first or second process)) wherein the first and second processes are the processes executed on the same layer of said received packet (Grohoski et al, Col. 6 Lines 49-67 and Col. 7 Lines 1-12, Since the additional data is used for processing the packet, both processes deal with the same layer of the packet).

However, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, it is respectfully submitted that the neither Patil nor Grohoski, however combined, teaches or suggests the aforementioned features of amended claim 1. The cited passages of Grohoski describe a process of processing a crypto packet (e.g., an IPsec process). For example, the cited passages recite:

[I]n operation 302, the CPU 205 receives a packet. In operation 304, the CPU 205 identifies the packet as a crypto packet (e.g.,

IPsec, SSL, TLS, etc.). In operation 306, the CPU 205 identifies any additional data required to execute the crypto packet. ... In operation 310, the CPU 205 identifies the additional data in the control queue 210. ... In operation 312, the CPU 205 transfers the crypto packet 222 to the crypto co-processor 250 and stores corresponding control word 212 to control queue 210. ... in operation 316, the crypto co-processor 250 receives the crypto packet 222 and retrieves the corresponding control word 212 from control queue 210. In operation 318, the crypto co-processor 250 processes the crypto packet 222. ... in operation 322, the crypto co-processor 250 updates the control word to identify the crypto packet as being completed.

It is respectfully submitted that the process of processing a crypto packet (e.g., IPsec) described in Grohoski is neither a teaching nor a suggestion of executing on the same layer of a received packet a first process for terminating a first security process for the received packet and a second process for terminating a second security process for the received packet, (i.e., duplicate execution of two, or more, security processes), as recited in amended claim 1. Thus, Grohoski does not provide a disclosure that remedies the deficiencies of Patil.

Independent claims 11 and 20 have been amended to recite the features of amended claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of amended claim 1.

Further, claims 2-7 and 9-10 depend from amended claim 1, claims 12-17 and 18-19 depend from amended independent claim 11, and claims 21-27 depend from amended independent claim 20, and are allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of the claims from which they depend.

Claims 8, 18 and 28

Claims 8, 18 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patil in view of Grohoski and further in view of Bos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,857 B1) (“Bos”). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Bos is cited as teaching a virtual machine configured on a first operation system. However, without conceding the propriety of the combination, it is respectfully submitted that

Bos does not add anything that would remedy the aforementioned deficiencies of Patil in view of Grohoski.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 18 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In light of the Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully request early and favorable action with regard to the present application, and a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey A. Haeberlin
Registration No.: 40,630

Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration No.: 34,672

STITES & HARBISON, PLLC
1199 North Fairfax Street
Suite 900
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: (703) 739-4900
Customer No. 38327

July 30, 2009

J65092:00040:114484:1:ALEXANDRIA